

~~Motion: Conceptual Approval and continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission with the following comments: 1) The Commission appreciates the changes that the applicant has made. 2) The size, bulk, and scale are acceptable. 3) One Commissioner thought the large negative space on the east elevation is lacking penetration. 4) The Commission appreciates the site layout and landscaping. 5) The Commission incorporated the comments from the previous motion into this motion.~~

~~Action: Murray/Hsu, 9/0/0.~~

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED**9. 101 GARDEN**

HRC-2/SP-2/SD-3 Zone

Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-630-018
Application Number: MST2004-00134
Owner: Wright Partners
Agent: Suzanne Elledge Planning
Architect: Peikert Group Architects

(The proposal consists of demolition of all existing structures on the sites and construction of 115 residential condominiums and 12 apartment units on four lots, totaling 5.3 acres. The site at 101 Garden Street is within the boundaries of Specific Plan #2. The proposal consists of a range of unit types, mix and affordability levels. Please refer to lengthy project description letter.)

(Second Concept Review.)

(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL, TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP, MODIFICATION, AND A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.)

(3:58)

Bill Wright, Owner; Detlev Peikert, Architect; Gordon Brewer, Architect; and Dave Davis, Consultant, present.

Public comment opened at 4:36 p.m.

Bill Mahan, Planning Commission (PC), complimented the applicants on their design and stated he will relate positive comments to the PC regarding the substantial improvements.

Public Comment closed at 4:37 p.m.

Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission with the following comments: 1) The Commission commended the applicant on the modulation of the project; the enhancement of the pedestrian passages through the site; and the substantial landscaping that goes down to the ground. The Commission expects continuation of these positive project elements. 2) The Commission is pleased with the design that accommodates all required parking. 3) The size, bulk, and scale are acceptable. 4) The architecture is generally acceptable. 5) Some Commissioners felt it would be advantageous to provide a commercial component to the project. 6) Return with larger scaled plans.

Action: La Voie/Pujo, 9/0/0.